

From: ["Synk, Polly \ \(AG\\)" <SynkP@michigan.gov>](mailto:SynkP@michigan.gov)
To: [Wood](#)
[Nicole](#)
CC: ["Saric, James" <saric.james@epa.gov>](mailto:saric.james@epa.gov)
["Bucholtz, Paul \ \(DEQ\\)" <BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov>](mailto:BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov)
Date: 1/9/2014 4:30:52 PM
Subject: RE: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Thank you for the EPA guidance document, and happy new year to you as well.

I am trying to find time to talk with Paul about this recent exchange on the Kalamazoo Site, MI rules, TMDLs and this most recent guidance; I don't know if it changes the analysis I had done on the floodplain/nonpoint source issues and the antidegradation rules, but this gives us more to talk about and more reason for me to broaden my understanding of TMDLs, which I actually had on my New Year's resolution list (OK, not really).

I will check in with Paul after his call tomorrow to get an idea of current timeframes for wrapping up our ARAR work (perhaps I am lucky and they have loosened a bit), but you can expect us to want to discuss this further before we send MDEQ's comments.

Thanks –

Polly

From: Wood, Nicole [mailto:wood.nicole@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 03, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Synk, Polly (AG)
Cc: Saric, James; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ)
Subject: RE: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Hi, Polly.

Happy 2014 to you.

I am attaching a recent EPA guidance document that is not exactly germane to the CWA issues at our site, but nonetheless provides a useful (and brief) discussion on the interface between CERCLA and the CWA at sediment sites. See pages 2 through 8.

We probably should catch up on this sometime in the next few weeks.

Hope all is well with everyone.

Nicole

From: Synk, Polly (AG) [<mailto:SynkP@michigan.gov>]

Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 3:27 PM

To: Wood, Nicole

Cc: Saric, James; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ)

Subject: RE: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Hi Nicole – I did not forget this, but should have let you know I was working on it – sorry to have left this hanging out there. I needed to speak to some water division folks to better understand their application of antidegradation requirements, and we did that – there are some details I am waiting to hear back on from them, but I should be ready to discuss early next week.

In the meantime, they asked how the EPA plans to list, or not, the CWA antideg requirements as a federal ARAR here.

Tuesday all day and Friday morning next week look pretty clear for me. I don't know if I will have complete info, but we can start the ball rolling. Thanks, Nicole –

Polly

Polly A. Synk

Assistant Attorney General

Michigan Department of Attorney General

ENRA Division

525 West Ottawa Street

Lansing, MI 48933

517-373-7540

517-373-1610 (fax)

synkp@michigan.gov

From: Wood, Nicole [<mailto:wood.nicole@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 3:30 PM

To: Synk, Polly (AG)
Cc: Saric, James; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ)
Subject: FW: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Hi, Polly.

Do you have time to talk next week, just lawyers, on the ARARs. I am wondering whether or not you plan on identifying the State antidegradation requirement as an ARAR for the River, I believe it is relevant and appropriate here being that PCBs will remain in the floodplains. I had sent you the guidance that supports that analysis in my previous email from 10/22/13.

Also, I think that the language I excerpted below from the attached document is incorrect: guidance documents can never be ARARs because they are not requirements, the PCB criterion of 3.9×10^{-6} ug/L is not enforceable under federal law, so I think it needs to be only a TBC, unless of course the State has rules or regulations that require that number to be met.

Section 2.3.1.3, page 2-4, Water - Specific ARARs: Great Lakes Water Quality Guidance (PCB criterion of 3.9×10^{-6} ug/L) and MDCH fish consumption advisory "trigger levels" are identified as TBCs. The PCB criterion of 3.9×10^{-6} ug/L should be considered relevant and appropriate.

From: Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ) [<mailto:BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 1:48 PM
To: Fortenberry, Chase
Cc: Draper, Cynthia E; Garret Bondy; Griffith, Garry T.; Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com; Todd King; Wood, Nicole; Synk, Polly (AG); Devantier, Daria W. (DEQ); Saric, James
Subject: RE: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Chase,

Enclosed are MDEQs preliminary draft comments on the revised Area 1 FS. We will continue to refine the comments and I will let you know if any remaining issues come to light. As Jim mentioned, we are continuing to work on ARAR related issues with EPA.

Let me know if you need to discuss any of the comments in more detail. We will continue to be available as we work through the issues and develop a final document.

Paul

From: Saric, James [<mailto:saric.james@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Fortenberry, Chase
Cc: Draper, Cynthia E; Garret Bondy; Griffith, Garry T.; Bucholtz, Paul (DEQ); Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com; Todd King; Wood, Nicole
Subject: EPA Preliminary Draft Comments on the OU 5, Area 1 FS

Chase,

Enclosed are EPA's preliminary draft comments on the Operable Unit 5, Area 1 revised Feasibility Study document. EPA may have additional comments, as we are working with MDEQ on a few remaining ARAR issues. We will get back to you with any further comments regarding those in the next couple weeks. Also, MDEQ will be sending you their draft comments on the Area 1 FS as well in the next few days.

Please give me a call to discuss how to address these before our 11/21 meeting. Also, we are available to discuss any of these comments before the meeting. We look forward to working with you to resolve these issues.

Thanks
Jim Saric
U.S. EPA Region 5
(312) 886-0992